

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

SAMUEL BAILEY, et al.,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:21-cv-00977-JCM-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 6]

13 Pending before the Court is the parties' proposed discovery plan seeking special scheduling  
14 review. Docket No. 6. For the reasons discussed below, the discovery plan is **DENIED** without  
15 prejudice.

16 When special scheduling review is requested, the discovery plan must provide "a statement  
17 of the reasons why longer or different periods should apply to the case." Local Rule 26-1(a). No  
18 reasons have been provided in the discovery plan for the special deadlines being sought.

19 Moreover, initial disclosures are generally due "at or within 14 days after the parties' Rule  
20 26(f) conference." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(C). Although the discovery plan does not identify the  
21 date of the Rule 26(f) conference, it seeks an initial disclosure deadline of roughly two months  
22 from now. *See* Docket No. 6 at 1. The only justification for that request for a lengthy extension  
23 is an unelaborated assertion that it is sought "to accommodate Plaintiff's schedule and business-  
24 related travel." *Id.* The Court is not persuaded that such a lengthy extension is justified based on  
25 that bald assertion.

26 Lastly, the discovery plan violates the local rules by providing a signature block for the  
27 Court's approval on a separate page. *Compare* Docket No. 6 at 3 *with* Local Rule IA 6-2.  
28

1 In light of the above, the discovery plan is **DENIED** without prejudice. An amended  
2 discovery plan must be filed by September 23, 2021.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: September 16, 2021

5  
6   
Nancy J. Koppe  
United States Magistrate Judge  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28